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A hopeful employee to be walks into an employer’s place of business. He walks up to the desk and announces his arrival. he finally gets called in to the boss’ office and finds himself sitting face to face with his hopeful employee. The man says to his boss to be “This job ain’t nothing i haven’t done before”. for obvious reasons to most people the man did not get the job. While this seems like common sense to a majority of people some would say that this is discrimination.

How can this be considered discrimination? The logic behind this is that this is the way that this person expresses themselves and that the employer should respect that. But when does respect of culture end and an employer’s right to choose the type of professionalism they demand in their workplace begin? The line between these two have become surprisingly blurred. The definition of workplace discrimination due to language is becoming more and more vague and allows more wiggle room than most people would consider discrimination.

This employer from the description at the beginning in most opinions was not guilty of discrimination. He or she was simply trying to uphold precedent of professionalism and a certain image for their company. If they expect their employees to speak and act a certain way then it is up to their discretion to hire people who embody that image that they seek. Critics have claimed that they are discriminating a culture, and holding people back just because of the way they speak. How can they be surprised that they did not receive the job? If someone walks into a job interview and uses improper grammar, curses, and speaks in a manner that does not exemplify a proficient employee then why is the employer called into question?

Some would argue that “proper English” is up to interpretation. While this is true that “proper English” is just a set of rules that were made up by a group of people long ago to embody a way of speaking that they thought was proper and correct, it cannot completely be ruled out.

Just because someone came up with this idea long ago and that their is technically not one way to speak does not mean it is worthless. This could be said about anything in the world, any set rule could be thrown out by this logic.

This is a pointless argument to this problem. Discrimination is separating someone because of an unchangeable quality about them that they cannot control. This would be true if it was talking about gender, age, race etc. This does not refer to dialect or the way that someone speaks. This is not saying that someone should completely abandon their qualities of life or their cultural ways, but this does not allow them to speak any way they want to employers and expect to still be employed. This a ridiculous claim that people should be hired no matter how they act or how they speak.

Someone’s chance of employment should be determined solely on merit and ability. This means that the way they speak comes into play into this decision. The way the speak is the way they carry themselves professionally. This is the way that they show who they are in a professional situation. The way they speak is the first thing the employer sees from this prospective employee. This is the front lines of their interview and it is no wonder that if this does not go well this person will have a slim chance of getting employed by this person. If this person speaks in an unprofessional manner then it is not surprising that this person will not get employed.

Along with this “proper” English issue arises a related but slightly different issue in the workplace regarding communication and language. That is, workers that do not speak English as their first language to the point where communication is strained, and it is hard for said employee to communicate with their employer, as well as, other staff members. This issue seems to be a little bit more touchy, but has almost the same answer to it. Employer’s discretion should come into play on this and allow them to chose the employee that performs best at their job. Included in this best fit for the job is communication, in fact in most jobs it is one of the more important aspects. If an employee cannot effectively communicate with other members of the company then how can they fight for their job and say that it was discrimination? Was the employer supposed to let his company suffer while he hires someone who does not fit the job description?
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